

REMARKS

Preliminary Matters and Status of the Application

First, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview that took place on September 13, 2010.

Prior to entry of the present Amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 12-17, 19, 24 and 26 were all the claims pending in the Application. After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 12-17, 19, 24 and 26 -29 will be all of the claims pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, 15, 17-19, 21-24 and 26 have been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WO 01/014962 to Nori, et al. (hereinafter “Nori”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,878 to Kohl (hereinafter “Kohl”). Still further, claims 2, 4, 14, and 16 have been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nori in view of Kohl, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,006 to Iriuchijima, et al. (hereinafter Iriuchijima).

Claims 1, 13 and 26 have been amended as set forth above, and new claims 27-29 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments and new claims are fully supported throughout the Specification as filed. For example, support for the amendments to claims 1, 13 and 26 can be found in pages 32-34 of the Specification as filed. On these pages of the Specification, the own permission is described in relation to the Owners user group, and the Homes data class. As described in the chart at the bottom of page 32, the Owners user group has the own permission with regards to the insert, delete and update database functions. The Specification makes it clear that these functions are only available “for their own homes.” Accordingly, the Specification clearly discloses a permission, in this case the own permission, which “depends on a relation between a specific user from a user group,” in this example a specific owner of a home, “and a specific one of the objects relevant within the software application,” in this case a specific home.

Applicant further submits that support for new claims 27-29 can be found, for example, on page 12, line 2 of the Specification as filed, which explicitly states that specific objects are stored in database tables. Furthermore, on page 16, lines 15-17 of the Specification as filed it is

disclosed that the user class is a data class, and therefore, the specific data associated with a specific user object would be stored in a database table. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that “a relation between the current user object and current data object” would be “a relation between a row value in a database associated with the specific user, and a row value in a database associated with the specific one of the objects.”

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12, 15, 17, 19, 24 and 26 have been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nori in view of Kohl. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

- a) a specification of a plurality of data classes, a data class being a description of objects relevant within the software application, and the plurality of data classes forming a structure by means of relations;
- b) a specification of at least one user group of the software application, a user group being defined as a group of users having common roles with regard to the software application; and
- c) an assignment of permissions to the at least one user group with respect to the plurality of data classes, wherein the value of each permission is follow foreign object or own,
wherein the permission own depends on a relation between a specific user from a user group and a specific one of the objects relevant within the software application.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Nori and Kohl fails to disclose *at least* these recitations of claim 1, and therefore, would have failed to render the claim obvious at the time of invention.

First, the Examiner concedes that Nori fails to disclose recitations b) and c) above. (Office Action dated April 28, 2010, paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6). Applicant further submits that Kohl fails to remedy these deficiencies in Nori. For example, Kohl fails to teach “wherein the permission own depends on a relation between a specific user from a user group

and a specific one of the objects relevant within the software application.” Instead, Kohl teaches that permissions can be set such that a user group can view all of a specific type of object, and simply limits the column or data fields for all of those objects. (Kohl, col, 7, lines 51-65). To use the specific example described in Kohl, the reference describes two user groups, “Salespeople in the LA Office” and “Salespeople in the Field.” The permissions are set for these two groups such that “Salespeople in the LA Office” can see all orders, but the “Ship From” column is not visible to them. (Kohl, col, 7, lines 55-57). The “Salespeople in the Field,” on the other hand, can also see all orders, but they can view the “Ship From” column. Yet, this disclosure fails to described a situation where “the permission ... depends on a relation between a specific user from a user group and a specific one of the objects relevant within the software application.” Said differently, there is simply no disclosure in Kohl of permissions being set based on a relationship between a specific salesperson and specific orders.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kohl fails to bridge the conceded deficiencies in Nori, and therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 13 and 26 patentably distinguish over the cited art for reasons analogous to those presented above with regards to claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 3, 5, 7, 12, 15, 17, 19, 24, and 27-29 patentably distinguish over the cited art due *at least* to their respective dependencies on claims 1, 13 and 26, as well as their additionally recited features.

Finally, Applicant submits that Iriuchijima also fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies in Nori, and therefore, claims 2, 4, 14, and 16 patentably distinguish over the cited art due *at least* to their respective dependencies on claims 1 and 13, as well as their additionally recited features.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Appln. No.: 10/525,382

Attorney Docket No.: Q86474

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. DeBoy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Mark J. DeBoy
Registration No. 66,983

Date: October 28, 2010